

Finally, the third major trend at the conference can be expressed in terms of a growing realization by all states that the oceans must be managed in a rational manner as opposed to the *laissez-faire* attitudes of the past. While it is desirable to maintain the ocean as a major thoroughfare for commerce, communications and general exchanges between nations, the time of unfettered freedom which has so often led to abuse is over. Navigation, fishing, research and exploration must be permitted and encouraged but they must also be made subject to appropriate controls, rules and standards.

Much of the debate that is going on has to do precisely with the reasonableness of such rules, their source and their enforcement. Canada has led the way in the protection of the marine environment. We have already legislated to control pollution in the Arctic and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Bay of Fundy, Queen Charlotte Sound, Dixon Entrance and Hecate Strait. For all practical purposes we are already managing these coastal areas as we would like to see economic zones managed. We hope that the conference will endorse these concepts and will apply them universally, taking into account the interest of the world community in international navigation and the special ecological or geographical circumstances that prevail in certain parts of the world.

What, then, can we expect from the next session of the conference which will start in Geneva in less than three weeks?

Quite frankly, the mandate of the conference is so complex and the remaining differences of views so serious that we cannot realistically expect the Geneva session to terminate its task on every single item. What we can aim for is very substantial progress. Progress of such magnitude that we will be in a position to see the precise contours of the package and to determine the timing of the final conclusion.

Let me be very clear. What we are seeking is an internationally negotiated solution to a series of inter-related problems of great political and economic importance. Such an international solution is by far preferable to unilateral or even regional action. But time is of the essence, not only for Canada, but for a lot of other countries.

We will not stand for a simple referral of the issues to one or more sessions unless we have reason to be confident in an early successful conclusion. That is a judgement which the Government will have to make at the end of the Geneva session. As my colleagues and I have said repeatedly since Caracas, should the conference fail or procrastinate, we will reassess all options and decide how best we can cope with our most urgent problems -- and the fisheries question is obviously high on the list -- in the light of prevailing circumstances.